IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

RONALD E. PROCTOR, JR.,)			
Plaintiff,)			
V •)	Civ.	No.	05-134-JJE
)			
CAPT CLYDE SEGARS, CPL. FRANK)			
KROMKA, LT. LARRY SAVAGE,)			
BRIAN ENGREM LAW LIBRARIAN,)			
and C/O JANE MORAN,)			
)			
Defendants.)			

ORDER

- 1. Plaintiff Ronald E. Proctor, Jr., SBI #163750, a pro se litigant who is presently incarcerated, filed this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.
- 2. Plaintiff alleges that on September 7, 2004, defendants Cpl. Frank Kromka and Capt Clyde Segars searched his cell without plaintiff being present. (D.I. 2 at 3) Plaintiff further alleges that defendants took his legal material and are denying him access to the courts. (Id. at 4)
- 3. Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g), a prisoner cannot bring a new civil action or appeal a judgment in a civil action in forma pauperis if he or she has three or more times in the past, while incarcerated, brought a civil action or appeal in federal court that was dismissed because it was frivolous, malicious, or

failed to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. The only exception to this is if the prisoner is in imminent danger of serious physical injury. A prisoner who is not proceeding <u>in forma pauperis</u> may file a new civil action or appeal even if that prisoner has three or more dismissals described in 28 U.S.C. 1915(g).

- 4. Regardless of whether a prisoner proceeds <u>in forma</u> pauperis in a civil case, if at any time the prisoner's case is dismissed as frivolous or malicious, or for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, the dismissal will count against the prisoner for purposes of the three-dismissal rule in 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). In <u>Keener v. Pennsylvania Bd. of Prob. & Parole</u>, 128 F.3d 143 (3d Cir. 1997), the Court held that dismissal as frivolous prior to the Prisoner Litigation Reform Act's enactment count towards the "three strikes" rule.
- 5. Proctor, while incarcerated, has filed at least six (6) civil actions that have been dismissed as frivolous or for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. See Proctor v. Scott, Civil Action No. 88-415-MMS (dismissed December 12, 1988); Proctor v. Watson, Civil Action No. 88-417-MMS (dismissed December 12, 1988); Proctor v. Haley, Civil Action No. 88-418-MMS (dismissed December 12, 1988); Proctor v. Avanzato, Civil Action No. 88-420-MMS (dismissed December 12, 1988); Proctor v. Gaddis, Civil Action No. 88-421-MMS (dismissed December 12, 1988);

December 12, 1988) and <u>Proctor v. Brasure</u>, Civil Action No. 01-013-JJF (<u>dismissed</u> January 8, 2001). Therefore, Proctor may not file another civil action <u>in forma pauperis</u> while incarcerated unless he is in "imminent danger of serious physical injury." 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). The present complaint does not meet that standard.

6. Proctor's motion for leave to proceed <u>in forma</u>

pauperis is denied. However, Proctor, is given thirty (30) days

from the date this order is sent to pay the \$250.00 filing fee.

If Proctor does not pay the filing fee within that time, he shall be dismissed as a plaintiff in this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C.

§ 1915(g).

DATED: 4 13/05

United States District Judge